UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,237	10/14/2003	Kenneth B. Stokes	P-3586.01 Continuation 3	4635
Kenneth J. Col	7590 01/30/2008		EXAM	INER
Medtronic, Inc. 710 Medtronic Parkway N.E. Minneapolis, MN 55432			KAHELIN, MICHAEL WILLIAM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3762	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
•			01/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/685,237	STOKES ET AL.	
Examiner-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Kahelin	3762	
All Participants:	Status of Application: per	ding	
(1) Michael Kahelin	(3)		
(2) <u>Kenneth Collier</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: 22 January 2008	Time: <u>3pm</u>		
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)		
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed: N/A			
Claims discussed: 36			
Prior art documents discussed: N/A	·		
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:	
Part III.			
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate r directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate r did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	e examiner will provide a writton ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview	
		•	
		✓ '	
•	GE P	ORGE R. EVANISKO RIMARY EXAMINER	
	•	1/25/7	
MI Will Washe			
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant	/Applicant's Representative S	gnature – if appropriate)	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner indicated that claim 36 does not include a positive recitation of genetic material or protein, thus only further limits the functional limitation on the implantable delivery means. Applicant indicated that the claim is meant to positively recite the genetic material or protein, and that the claim will be amended accordingly in the next response to the PTO.